

REMARKS

This amendment after final rejection should be entered because it amends claims 18 and 19 in the manner suggested in the Action to overcome minor issues regarding the form of the claims, e.g., grammatical issues, in the rejection. *See* 37 C.F.R. §1.116 (b).

The objection and rejection of claims 18 to 22 have been overcome by amendment. Claims 18 and 19 have been amended to cure grammatical issues identified in the Action. Claim 18 has been amended to change the term “desired” competence to “predetermined level of” competence to overcome the indefiniteness rejection. Support for predetermined level of competence is in the original application at page 12, ln. 25 to page 13, ln. 14 and page 14, lns. 10-15.

The rejection of claims 1 to 22 as being anticipated by George (US Patent 5,978,648) is traversed. George does not disclosed may of the elements recited in the claims including (without limitation):

1. Independent claims 1, 10 and 18 include limitations for a first, second, third and fourth memories storing course selections, study materials, individually adapted course plans and completed course plans and course sections, respectively. George does not disclose a user computer device having a first memory storing course selections, a second memory storing study materials for course sections, a third memory device storing individual adapted course plans and a fourth memory device storing completed course sections and course plans. The Action does not identify a first, second, third or fourth memories in George or identify any memory that stores course selections, individually adapted course plans or completed course plans and course sections.

2. Independent method claims 10 and 18 require a step of choosing course selections from the first memory devices to create a course plan adapted to the individual. George does not disclose a method step in which a user accesses a first memory device to choose course selections to create an individual adapted course plan based on an individual competence. George discloses a “performance assessment system” that facilitates “performance and assessment of a student’s academic development.” George, col. 1, lns. 8-12. An assessment system does not constitute a method or system for selecting courses, generating a course plan, storing course study material and tracking completed courses.
3. George does not disclose storing the individual adapted course plan in a third memory device, as recited in claims 1, 10 and 18.
4. George does not disclose downloading studying material from a second memory device as required by claims 10 and 18.
5. George does not disclose calculating a plan completion date for an individual adapted course plan, as required by claims 1, 10 and 18.
6. George does not disclose storing an indication in a fourth memory device that the user has completed a course action, as required by claims 1, 10 and 18.

With respect to the dependent claims, George does not disclose validating a user before the user takes course sections as set forth in claim 19; George does not disclose a test generator for randomized list as required by claim 20; George does not disclose generating test questions regarding theoretical questions and test items of practical events relating to the course sections as required by claim 21, and George does not disclose test items for practical events that are

presented to the user in a chronological order in accordance with the production process or station system, as required by claim 22.

The sections of George cited in the USPTO action do not disclose the above identified elements of the claims. The quotations taken from George do not constitute disclosure of a system or method that is recited in the claims of this application. In particular, George at col. 1, lns. 7-16, does not disclose a control system having access to four memory devices but rather seems to refer to a single computer system likely having a single memory device (claims 1, 8 and 10); George at col. 2, lns. 7-10 does not disclose selection of course sections but rather shows a method for teachers to select individual tasks for a student (claims 1, 8 and 10); George at col. 2, lns. 19-27 provides students access to materials but does not clearly describe study material for an entire course (claims 1, 8 and 10); George at col. 2, lns. 7-10 and col. 6, lns. 48-52 describes performance assessment tasks for determining entry level knowledge but this is not a disclosure of a course plan with ideal course times for completing the courses (claims 1, 8 and 10); George at col. 2, lns. 35-38 refers to a memory, e.g., CD-ROM, for storing course work but a CD-ROM with course work is not a disclosure of storage of a course plan with completed course sections (claims 1, 8 and 10); George in Figure 11 (item 170) does not disclose the cursors on a display to display different statuses of a course section for a student (claims 5 and 6); and George at col. 8, lns. 20-29 disclosure of a student home page is not a disclosure of a start and stop timer for tracking student time in course work (claims 6, 7 and 12).

All claims are in good condition for allowance. If any small matter remains outstanding, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' attorney. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of this application is requested.

KRANTZ et al.
Appl. No. 10/098,513
December 28, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Jeffry H. Nelson/

Jeffry H. Nelson
Reg. No. 30,481

JHN:glf
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100